

### MEMBER'S REPRESENTATION

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—Sir, I want to know whether I will have an opportunity to speak on this report.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no question of giving chances to all those who have given their names to me. I will follow the order in the list of priority. I will give chances to those persons who have given notices earlier.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMAIYA.—I have also given notice earlier i.e. yesterday. This is not an ordinary matter and I would speak only for about five minutes. It seems you want to hear only one side. Both sides must be heard on this subject.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall be bound to adjourn the House if the members of his party behave like this.

---

### DISCUSSION ON A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE, NAMELY, GOVERNMENT ORDER ON NAGAN GOWDA COMMITTEE'S FINAL REPORT.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I value the privilege of having to speak on a subject of great importance which vitally affects more than 70 to 80 per cent of the total population of this enlarged Mysore State. I must be pardoned if I make an observation that it is characteristic of this Government when, whenever they take vital decisions of a far-reaching nature, they do not even take the House into their confidence. I had occasion to make this observation more than once and this is one such instance. When the Interim Report of the Nagan Gowda Committee was presented and the Government took a decision on it, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister assured us that because this was an interim report and they had to settle the question of admissions to colleges, technical institutions and professional colleges the matter need not be discussed then and that, when the final report is received, they would take a firm decision only after consulting everybody concerned.

Sir, even after the presentation of the report of the Nagan Gowda Committee, I am afraid the Government did not stick to their assurance held out indirectly. They passed the order just 48 hours before this Hon'ble House sat in session. I do not know why there was mortal hurry, indecent haste to precipitate an order of this kind. Sir, as far back as 1918, the Government of Mysore appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of the then Chief Judge of the Mysore Court and the order on that was in the nature of a charter for backward classes in the State. In making observations on this Report, nobody should understand that I am a communalist or I am a sectionalist. If there was provision in the Constitution relating to the directive principles of the Constitution under Clause 16 (4) for the welfare of backward classes,

I would not have urged this. On all the occasions I have condemned this report I have never approached the subject from the point of view of any particular community though propaganda has been carried on in that direction against me. I have fought for the whole cause of entire backward community and not for any one community. The points which I wish to make in the beginning in that here is a committee which took 16 months to produce a report of 30 pages. I have the highest respect for Dr. Nagan Gowda who is the Chairman of this Committee and every member of the Committee. I yield to none in my respect, affection and esteem to every one of those members of the Committee individually and collectively. When I make a few very strong observations, I do not want them to feel that I have hurt them. I have no such intention. Sir, in a matter of this kind, it would have been better having regard to the traditions of this great State if one of the judges of the High Court either who is in service or who can bring to bear judicial frame of mind had been entrusted with this task and similarly it would have been appropriate and in the fitness of things if this Committee had been constituted with persons who had knowledge of economic statistics, people who had worked as statisticians, who can interpret facts and figures and who had a real insight into all political aspects. I do not wish to make any observations against any individual member. In a matter of this kind, the Constitution of the Committee itself, it seems to me, was rather not proper and it is no wonder therefore that the report now before us reveals a very lamentable state of affairs from the point of view of the entire State. Sir, I shall now refer to the terms of Reference to the Committee and wish to place before this House whether the committee in their findings have given definite answer to those questions referred to them. The first term of reference was to suggest the criteria to be adopted in determining which section of the people in the State should be treated as socially and educationally backward. In regard to the concept of social backwardness, I am afraid, the Committee themselves have admitted in the body of the report that they have not been able to come to a definite conclusion as to how the social backwardness has got to be determined. Sir, in this connection, we have to remember that the Government of India set up a Backward Classes Commission under the leadership of Kaka Saheb Kalelkar and even that Committee went into this question of social backwardness. The Hon.ble Finance Minister Sri T. Mariappa had the honour of being one of the members on that committee, who played no mean part in shaping the report which was ultimately presented to the Government of India. It is unfortunate that the Government of India have not taken a decision on that report and it has not seen the light of the day. Even that committee of the highest level could not arrive at definite conclusions as to what exactly is meant by social backwardness. This expression is nowhere definitely stated in the Constitution. That is one thing.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

In regard to the educational backwardness, the committee which went into the question, submitted an interim report. It said literacy is the criterion to be fixed to assess whether a particular community was backward or not. I do not know the compelling reasons that made to change this criterion when they submitted the final list to the Government. After this committee was constituted, the Chief Minister who inaugurated the work of this committee on 25th January 1960 requested the committee to submit an interim report to enable the Government to determine quickly the class of persons who should secure preference in admission to the various educational institutions. I am now making a definite observation that this report is not acceptable for the reasons quoted by the committee itself in their report. On page 8 of the report committee admits that they could not get up-to-date figures of population on community basis in the State. That statement definitely goes against the committee itself. If the population figures themselves were not correct, how did the percentages were worked out? I know that subsequent to 1951 census, census enumeration on the basis of caste and communities was prevented by the Government of India and when the Government could not furnish accurate figures to the committee in respect of different communities in the State, on what basis the committee came to conclusion in regard to allocation of seats to each community. That one thing goes contrary to the stand taken by the committee. In regard to educational backwardness, as I have already stated, it is not clear why they first took literacy as the basis, and changed it to "last three classes of high school". Even in that respect, the number of students studying in the last three classes of the high schools were not made available for the total population. So, where did they get figures of different communities and castes studying in the last three classes of high schools? So, it clearly shows that there was no rationale behind the conclusions reached.

I do not want to go into the details of several recommendations made in the report. A department like the Census Department which is the Government of India Department, has furnished some figures. The Committee says: "The Census Department has furnished the committee with approximate population figures for most of the communities in the State and the percentage of literacy amongst them according to 1941 census." Even granting that they had that as the basis, during every decennial period the growth of population in India is definitely more and it is an ascertainable figure. The increase in population for each decennial census is at the rate of 2.1. and increase in the several communities could be worked out.

Again, they have made an interesting observation. "The problem of backwardness is the direct result of defective social order. I do not know what is the point in making observations without reaching any conclusions. They further say "It is not possible to adopt any other

basis except caste and community.....' The committee has got into a vicious circle not knowing how to get out of it.

This one thing ought to convince us that this committee's report has got to be scrapped and it is thoroughly improper to act on that report. In the year 1961 when all over the country steps have been taken to secure national integration, emotional integration, when ideas of linguism, groupism and casteism, have got to be discarded, for this committee to suggest that it is impossible to assess backwardness of any particular community except on the basis of caste. This is a matter about we have to bow down our heads in shame. Even after taking decisions at the highest level that castes and communities should not be taken into consideration in regard to any matter, can we expect any report of this kind? Have the Government after the Integration Committee and after the Communications were received by the Government, taken any step to see that this order is quashed or amended or see that something is done to the backward Communities? If it is the intention of the Government that directive principles of the Constitution have got to be respected, you have got to care for the welfare of the backward classes. Without knowing what their strength is, how are you going to do it? At one time I suggested that for the purpose of the State use, you have to take census on the basis of caste. That was not accepted. I want to ask on what basis are you going to know the exact figures? I suggested an alternative. I cited the example of the Maharashtra State where economic basis is the only consideration for giving seats to pupils in the educational institutions.

**Sri B. D. JATTI.**—If the Hon'ble Member were to yield, I want to say that the Government of Maharashtra have not acted under Article 15(1). They have acted under Article 46 of the Constitution by giving financial assistance.

3-00 P.M.

**Sri J. B. MALLABADHYA.**—I do not dispute the stand taken by the Hon'ble Chief Minister, but so long as the constitutional provision exists, some concrete steps should be taken by every State Government and the Central Government to guard the interests of the backward communities. When the Government came to the conclusion and when they passed an order on the basis of this report, should not at least the Government convince themselves that what they did was correct and was based on facts and figures. I will come to the Government Order and show how inconsistent it is. Before doing that, there is another point.....

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I am told that the Government Order is *subjudice*. The Supreme Court is seized of this case. There is an appeal by an aggrieved student.

**Sri J. B. MALLABADHYA.**—I am fully aware of that.



†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—On a point of clarification, Sir. You say, that the Supreme Court is seized of the matter. There may be a petition filed before the Supreme Court in respect of one particular student. Does it mean that the whole order is *subjudice*? The proceedings are not started and we do not know what the representations are. Under these circumstances, we will not be well advised to come to the conclusion that the whole order is *subjudice*. If that is *subjudice* they cannot give effect to the order but the order is in force, to-day.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—How far the constitutional interpretation can be affected by our commenting upon the constitutional provision or the backwardness of a community, I am unable to understand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The report can be discussed, but we should be cautious in discussing the Government Order.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Mr. Narasimhan's view does not appear to be correct. If application is based on a grievance said to have arisen out of the orders made by this Government., then the whole question, arguments, reasoning, etc., will be discussed. Therefore, the whole thing becomes *subjudice* and so the Government Order cannot be discussed.

M. C. NARASIMHAN.—A particular community which is not included in the Backward Class might agitate before the Supreme Court saying the particular community should have been included. That does not mean that the Government Order cannot be discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does he know what is pending adjudication in the Supreme Court? I know that the Government Order is before the Supreme Court for adjudication.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—On what basis is the writ petition filed before the Supreme Court? We are not here to accept bluntly what is stated in the news paper.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have taken this information from the Government and not from the newspaper. Show me the evidence to the contrary. Government words have to be respected. When the Government says that the Government Order is before the Supreme Court for adjudication, I take it that the whole matter is *subjudice*. If Members have evidence to the contrary, let them show it to me.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am not going to comment on the Government Order since you have given a ruling that it is *subjudice*.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sir, two applicants before the Supreme Court have questioned among other things the basis of classification of the backward classes in the State and the Government Order listing Backward Classes as unconstitutional. The Mysore Government have filed their counter affidavit.

**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.**—It would have been fair if this matter had been brought to your notice earlier. There is failure both on your part and on the part of the Leader of the House.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I take objection to what he says. I have taken all care to see whether the G. O. is before the Supreme Court for adjudication or not.

**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.**—Is there anything for us to discuss at all in view of this?

**ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.**—ಇಗ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಸರ್ವಜುಡೀಸ್ ಎಂದು. ಯಾವಾಗ ಸರ್ವಜುಡೀಸ್ ಆಯಿತೋ ಅಗ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಕೇಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ? ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಬೆಳಗ್ಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಪುನಃ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ಸೇರುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯೇ ಇರುತ್ತಿರಲ್ಲ.

**ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.**—ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವಂತನಕ ಕೇಳಿ ಆ ಮೇಲೆ he may speak whatever he likes ಎಂದೋ ಈಗ ರಾಕ್ಷುಕಾಲ ಇವ್ವಹಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ರಾಕ್ಷುಕಾಲ ಪೋಗಿ ಗೂಳಿಕಾಲು ಎದ್ದಹಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಎರಡು. ಒಂದು ಗಾರ್ನ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆರ್ದರ್, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್. ಗಾರ್ನ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆರ್ದರ್ ಸರ್ವಜುಡೀಸ್ ಇದೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಸರ್ವಜುಡೀಸ್ ಇದೆಯೇ ಯಾವುದು ಸರ್ವ ಜುಡೀಸ್ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ Members must know the difference between the Nagan Gowda Committee Report and the Government Order. The Government Order might have been issued accepting the Nagan Gowda Committee Report. But the Nagan Gowda Committee Report is a different matter. The can speak on the report but not on the Government Order which is strictly *sub judice*.

**Sri. B. K. PUTTARAMIAH.**—The item put on the agenda paper is "Sri J. B. Mallaradhya to raise a discussion regarding the Government Order on Nagan Gowda Committee final Report" So, we have to discuss only the Government Order.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—After all they have read only what is stated in the list of Business I will read the whole notice. He wants to raise discussion not only on the G. O. but he also wants to raise a discussion on the Nagan Gowda Committee Report. The agenda gives only the gist of what Sri J. B. Mallaradhya has given notice of. I have allowed discussion on the Nagan Gowda Committee Report and not on the G. O.

**ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡ.**—ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿ ಅಸ್ತಿತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇವಲ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ಅಚ್ಚು ಯಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Then I will have to stop discussion and rule it one as out of order. I have read the whole notice carefully. He wants to raise a discussion not only on the G. O. but also on the Nagan Gowda Committee Report. I have told him that he cannot raise a discussion on the G. O. because it is *sub judice* but he wants to raise a discussion on the Nagan Gowda Committee Report. I have absolutely no objection to his doing so and he has accepted that position.

**Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.**—I would like to submit to you that Nagan Gowda Committee Report is not operative because the Government have modified the Committee Report and passed the Government Order.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—He and I have been precluded from raising a discussion on it because it is *sub judice*. Did he not hear what Sri Mallaradhya has been talking so long? He did not refer to the Government Order. He referred only to the Nagan Gowda Committee Report. I must compliment him.

**Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIAH.**—How can we discuss on the Report? The Government have modified it. We have only to discuss the Government Order. The Report is not in existence at all because the Government have not accepted it.

**Sri F. X. DENIS PINTO.**—If we criticise the Report, it means that we criticise the Government Order because the Government have taken certain decisions on the Nagan Gowda Committee Report.

**Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.**—The main subject is the Government Order. The Speaker has already given a ruling that the Government Order cannot be discussed here. The whole chapter is therefore closed.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Sri Mallaradhya wanted to raise two questions. One question is about the Report of the Nagan Gowda Committee. The second is the Government Order on the Committee Report. I made it abundantly clear to him that the Government Order could not be discussed and that if he wanted to discuss the Report; I would have no objection. I also made it plain to him that he should not refer to the Government Order. He has promised me and he has kept up his promise. He is talking only on the Report.

**Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIAH.**—There is no use in discussing the Nagan Gowda Committee Report at all.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕೊನೆಯ ವಿನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಇವತ್ತು ಕಡೆದಿನ. ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧೀನ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಇವತ್ತು ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಫೈನರ್ ವರದಿಯಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈಗಿನ ತಕ್ಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಡಿರ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇರತಕ್ಕ ನೋಟೀಸನ್ನು ನೀವು ಅರಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆ. ಆ ನೋಟೀಸನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಓದಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಅದರ ತಮಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. The notice given by Sri J. B. Mallaradhya is in our office. ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ.

**Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIAH.**—We are not aware of the notice. This notice is issued by the office on behalf of the speaker.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—He is aware of that. But I say that I have looked into the whole notice.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಕೊನೆಯ ಎಂದು ನೀವು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನು? ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಳೆಯದೂ ಸಹ ಸೇರುತ್ತೆ, ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಆಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಫೈನಲ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಪ್ರೋವ್ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ? ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದು ಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರು ಮತ್ತು ಯಾವುದು ಬೇಡವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟರು. ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ ಈ ವರದಿಯಿಂದ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ? ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಏನೂ ಉಪಯೋಗವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ, ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I say this is the ruling. I will not allow any member to question it. Two matters were raised by the Hon'ble Sri J. B. Mallaradhya in his notice. The first is that he want to discuss the Government Order and the second is the Nagan Gowda Committee Report on which the Government Order is passed. I told him that since the G.O. had been challenged in the Supreme Court it could not be discussed because of it being *sub judice* and that I would not therefore allow any discussion on that. Thereafter he said that he would raise a discussion on the Report of the Nagan Gowda Committee only. I told him that if he would agree to strictly adhere to that, I would have no objection. So, I have allowed it on the definite understanding that he would not speak on the G.O. That is my ruling and I will not allow any member to say whether he has a right to discuss the G.O.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am sorry that this matter should have given room for this kind of discussion. I was very clear in my mind when I sent the notice what I should speak. After all, this House gets so many reports and we discuss many reports. This Nagan Gowda Committee report is one such reports which is an important one and it has not come before us for discussion. I said a real purpose would be served by focussing the attention of the Hon'ble Members to the loopholes that are contained in the report and the serious consequences that will ensue if this report is implemented in full or in part. That is all my purpose. I also promise the Speaker that I will not comment on the G.O.

The question of social status according to community is stated in page 13 of the report. I am afraid what the committee says is not a correct way of judging the social backwardness of any community.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I want to know whether any reference to the criteria that the Nagan Gowda Committee has adopted would not amount to *sub judice* because the Government Order is passed on that report. I am not trying to question the ruling or disputing it. You were pleased to say that no reference can be made to the Government Order. But, the Government Order is based on the criteria suggested by the Nagan Gowda Committee. So, will not any criticism of the criteria adopted would mean criticism of the Government Order itself?

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.**—The Nagan Gowda Committee report deal with something and the affidavit filed in the case is something. My Hon'ble friend is speaking on the report and not on the G.O.

**Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.**—I humbly submit that the Government have not rejected the criteria suggested by the committee. Government have accepted the criteria suggested and made certain modifications.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—In this case, there are two things. One is, the criteria adopted by the committee in its report and the second is, the modified criteria adopted by the Government. What is before the Supreme Court is, the modified criteria adopted by the Government and not the criteria adopted by the Nagan Gowda Committee. The criteria adopted by the committee can be discussed and not the modified criteria.

**Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.**—If the Chair says that a ruling is given on the point of order I have raised, I have nothing to say. But, I want to submit that the criteria has been accepted. It is only regarding a decimal portion of recommendations the Government have modified the recommendations. But the criteria evolved by the committee report has been accepted by the Government and has been acted upon and on that basis G.O. has been issued. So, I submit that it would be *subjudice* to discuss the criteria itself.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—If the Government Order is pending adjudication before the Supreme Court, it will pass its judgement on the G.O. and not on the committee report. After all the point is, whether the criteria of Nagan Gowda Committee Report should or should not have been adopted in a modified form. That is a different thing. But, when we discuss the criteria of the committee report, we do not discuss the Government Order.

**Sri R. CHANNIGARAMIAH.**—The Hon'ble Member Sri J. B. Mallaradhy was pleased to say that several reports come up before the House for discussion. But, that is done before the Government Order is passed on such reports and not after the order is passed. If we discuss reports before the Government Orders are issued, it would be really useful. When once a G.O. is issued, it serves no purpose in discussing it. This is a difficult subject and especially this subject ought to have been brought before the House before six months and not at the time of elections. If we discuss it now, it will tell upon the candidates at the elections. So, on this last day of bidding farewell, let us not quarrel on this communal question.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—If it is an appeal by Sri R. Channigaramiah, it is for Sri J. B. Mallaradhy to act upon. In this case, the G.O. should not be raised and on that condition I have allowed the discussion on the report.

3- 30 P.M.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have no difficulties of the nature referred to by Hon'ble Mr. Chennigaramaiah in regard to the ensuing general elections. I had not the ghost of a chance of even thinking of the general elections when I moved the motion.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—In order to safeguard Mr. Mallaradhy, I said it. *(laughter)*

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I can take care of myself. I would not ask Mr. Chennigaramaiah to come to my constituency and do propaganda for me; even if he is prepared to do that, I would not take him at his work. I am quite certain that whatever speech I may make on the floor of this House is not going to materially alter my future. My only purpose is to bring to the notice of the Government and the Hon'ble Members of this House that the Nagan Gowda Committee report has resulted in gross injustice to a large majority of Mysore's population.

In regard to the social status, we are living at a time when there is a thorough economic and social transformation going on in this country. For the Committee to say that social backwardness has got to be judged or assessed on the basis of status accorded to the community in general, is rather hazy and uncertain which could not be depended upon. It is most unfortunate that the committee should have suggested this without going into the details.

With regard to educational backwardness.....

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—By attacking the Nagan Gowda Committee report, are we not strengthening Government's case for amending the report? *(laughter)*

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If the Government is thinking that I am supposing it I am prepared to submit myself to that position. Mr. Narasimhan in his usual style, has gone out of the groove. Of course, he does not mean his remark seriously. He wants to keep the debate lively.

In regard to educational backwardness, I do not know why they said it is not possible to find out the number of persons of a community who have passed a particular examination. This is one of those statements which shows the helplessness to which the Committee landed itself. If it is a public examination, the names of the candidates, the school or places from which he sat for examination, etc., will be available in the official records. Was it difficult for the Director of Public Instruction to furnish this figure on the basis of the examinations, say a degree examination or a B.Sc or M.Sc or any other examinations. Should not the Committee find out why they took the last 3 classes. There is no clarification forthcoming on this matter. Without being uncharitable to the Committee, I think they should have something at the back of their mind. They perhaps thought that a certain

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

community would not get sufficient percentages to come within the purview of backwardness. After all, the minimum qualification required for entry into service is S.S.L.C. They could have taken the number of students of a particular community in the S.S.L.C. examinations. They have not furnished any such figures. Our doubts increase that this must have been deliberately kept back. They took different averages for assessing the educational backwardness. In one case it is 1959-60. Even according to the census figures or statistics furnished to them, they are not uniform in the application of the principles. If they have taken the average for 1950-60 in one case, they should have applied the same set of figures. I see that there is needless variation without sufficient cause.

Coming to the last, that is, representation of a community in the Government services, there is a lot of nebulousness. Take statements 3 and 4 in the appendix. Statement 4 gives the representations of communities in service in Government as on 31st March 1959. There is a column for the percentage of total number of persons employed in Government services. Here are certain communities which are 19 per cent, 12 per cent, 10 per cent, 74 per cent, etc. If a particular community has got 5 per cent in Government services, it is not classified as backward whereas a community which has less than that percentage is treated as backward, without sufficient grounds. Even there is no uniform principle. This is a basis on which I challenge the Nagan Gowda Committee Report and its conclusions.

Take some of these communities. I have a statement given to me by a friend. Against the name of Devanga Community, they have written certain sub-sects. In regard to certain communities, the committee has gone out of the way to split up the entire community, which was an integrated community. Supposing there are half a dozen sub-sects in the Devanga Community, Nekara Padmashali, etc., why should they split up? Why should the community of weavers be split up into so many sub-sects? When once some of these sub-castes are recognised, they get representation in the State services and those who do not come in the sub-section have naturally a grievance in the classification. This is calculated to create disharmony and disorder in particular communities. This disastrous consequence do not appear to have occurred to the Hon'ble Members of this Committee.

In the interim report, they compiled a statement of appointments in Government services. There they took, into account services only upto Class III, whereas in the final report, even class IV is taken in account. Class IV consists of attendants and menial services. As we know, every office has got half-a-dozen peons. On the ground that members of a particular community have got hundreds and thousands of peons, does it give a fair indication of the adequate representation of that community in the State services. As to why Class IV staff are



included in the final computation and not in the interim report, is not clear. Not a word of explanation is forthcoming. The only inference could be that they wanted certain communities to be excluded or certain communities to be included. The figures adopted by the committee for the purpose of calculating representations of the various communities in the State services are based on those supplied by the State Statistician. The only source which we can recognise in this regard is the Public Service Commission. They have got various statistics. We get authorized reports from them from time to time. That report is also sent to the Government periodically. In spite of that, the committee has gone to the State Statistician. He is not the repository of the figures of this kind. As to why the P.S.C. figures were not acted upon or called for is a matter on which we have not received satisfactory explanation. Were these figures given by the State statistician verified with reference to the P.S.C. figures. So far as we in the Legislature is concerned, it is not the State Statistician's figures relating to recruitment that we take but we depend on the P.S.C.'s figures.

On page 22 we find a sentence in para 7. "There are several minor communities which are backward in all respects; but for whom population figures and figures of students studying in High School Classes are not available". At the time the Nagan Gowda Committee began functioning, in every school of the State, whether it was a Government school or private school, in the admission form, there was a column indicating the community or the caste to which he belongs. It would not have been difficult if an effort was made through the D.P.I. to furnish these figures. That there are several minor communities who are backward, is admitted by the Committee itself. In spite of that, they say they could not get figures; but still they classify them under categories backward, more backward and less backward and forward. What is the reliance that I can place upon a report of this kind? I would refer to another statement. Paragraph 9 on page 22 :

"We have decided that such of the socially Backward Communities whose standard of education is less than 50 per cent of the State...."

This is the worst part of the Report which I find from the Nagan Gowda Committee Report. I cannot reconcile myself to a statement of this kind. The Brahmin community, for example, has got a percentage of 74 literary or educated people and to compare it with people who are .02 and to say that the State average is less than 20 and to say that more than 70 per cent literacy is among Brahmins and all the rest nearly 80 per cent of the total population has less 20 per cent of education and to say that all those whose standard of education is less than 50 per cent of the State average should be classified as [more backward classes, is a thing which I cannot understand.

In regard to the observation made on Page 24 that "the minimum that should be reserved for backward classes (excluding Scheduled Castes

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

and Scheduled Tribes) (1) For purpose of admission to technical institutions should be 50 per cent of the total number of seats available, and (2) for recruitment to Government Service 45 per cent of the posts available", what is the actual fact or evidence placed before them to make them arrive at this conclusion. That is the point at which no clarification is forthcoming from the report. In every report of this kind it is usual that we get an indication of the reasons that promoted the Committee to make their observations and conclusions. Here they say that the minimum to be reserved for purpose of admission to technical institutions 50 per cent. Whether having regard to the existing state of affairs, there is adequate representation for all the backward communities in the State, having regard to any considerations, it may be on the basis of population, the number of educated people, the number of people in the services; having regard to the very considerations which the Committee accepted, did they ascertain what is the number of people of that community who are in the professional and technical colleges. Was the Committee aware that at the time of drafting the report, the representation of backward communities who were proposed to be admitted to these technical and professional colleges was grossly inadequate to the total population and even to the total number of students studying in those colleges? I do not want to go into the effect of the classification, which has resulted in more than 80 per cent of seats going to a particular community.

Here is another observation. It seems to me to be very perverse that having regard to the actual figures furnished in Statement IV that the Committee should have come to the conclusion that certain Communities and castes are backward. I do not wish to name the communities, but on their own figures I consider that the decisions reached are perverse and illogical and cannot stand the test of scrutiny. In regard to the observations made that Committee recommend that the list of backward classes should be reviewed after ten years, "ದೇವರೇ ಗಾ." if you are going to wait for ten years depending upon the committee report, the whole category of backward classes will be wiped out from the Mysore State.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—The Honourable Member has not given his suggestions, as to what should according to him be the criteria.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want economic backwardness alone to be taken into consideration along with the educational backwardness and the minimum educational qualifications to be a pass in the S.S.L.C. Examination. And so far as merit is concerned now if you say economic basis as in Maharashtra—I understand that both in the Maharashtra State and in the Andhra State, this economic classification is working very well during the last two years; it is their experience. So far as educational backwardness is concerned, you must take that community which has got largest number of candidates who have passed S.S.L.C. as

most highly qualified and those which are backward are those who have got less number of candidates who have passed S.S.L.C. Economic backwardness is one of the criteria to judge social backwardness.

† Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, it is rather a hard job to speak on such a subject within five minutes. Since it is a directive, I am up to the game, Sir.

Sir, I consider this as a vital important matter over which we should have been given more time to put forth our views. The question of classification of backward classes is very vexed question. Last time when the interim report was placed before this House, we had an opportunity to discuss and the opinions expressed then were available both to the Members of the Committee and the Government. At that time I supported the main findings of the interim report of Nagan Gowda Committee. Sir, they say that economic classification cannot be made; I do not know if it is true. If Maharashtra has made it, I do not why it cannot be made here I shall not go into that question because, economic classification may not mean taking social and educational backwardness into account. Sir, I do not want to go into all the social and political controvercies but I will only invite the attention of this House to two decisions of the High Court of this State. All the arguments advanced by Mr. Mallaradhyia here, were more or less advanced before the High Court. Rightly or wrongly, the High Court has not accepted those arguments. Sir, the Committee suggested literacy as the yardstick to determine the educational backwardness. Now, they changed over. At the time they changed over, they had before them the opinion expressed in this House and two decisions of the Hon'ble High Court in Mysore. This aspect came up before them for consideration and the Hon'ble Chief Justice had categorically expressed the opinion that literacy is the only yardstick for determining educational backwardness. The decision was by Hon'ble Narayan Pai and Hon'ble Iqbal Hussain. There also something came up for consideration and they say that literacy is the yardstick capable of determining that position and so it should be adopted. So, adoption of literacy is a very valid contention. The Advocate General was asked to defend the position of literacy, but on the other hand the petitioners said that literacy is not the correct yardstick and something else should be adopted. Kaka Kalekar went to the extent of including women into backward classes. Late Mr. Govind Vallabh Panth had to tear this in the final Government Order. So, Sir, it is all a complex question. What Mr. Jatti says or what his Cabinet says is not the final one. It is a matter of enormous debate and interminable debate. Sir, the method of classification on caste idea is an evil which we have to tolerate. It is an evil which you cannot avoid. But, how for will you tolerate this evil is the point. Will you tolerate this evil for eternity or for a short time? From the Government Order or from the decision taken by the Nagan Gowda Committee, this vital point is not at all answered. If the Committee says that these are the communities which

(Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN)

are backward and they require protection under Articles 15(4) and 16(4), I can understand. But, should there not be a limit within which we say some other criteria should be adopted? We are taking of national integration and emotional integration and communal harmony and all that. Till elections we need not have those considerations because other considerations are necessary as pointed out by a very able administrator like Mr. Chennigaramiah. At least after the election, for heaven's sake, say the time limit within which this ceases. Have we not said ten years in the case of S.C. and S.T. people? You can change it, but as things stand, it is ten years. So, Sir, whatever may be the protection that is sought to be given to these communities I am not going to quarrel because some protection is needed. But, this protection should be for a particular period and Government must review it after that particular period. Make it five years or ten years I have no objection.

4-00 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಪ್ರಾ.ಮಿ, ಈ ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಕಂಸನಿಗೂ ಕೃಷ್ಣನಿಗೂ ಯುದ್ಧ ಹೂಡಿದ ಹಾಗಿದೆ. ದೇವತೆಯ ಅಪ್ಪಮ ಗರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಿಸಿದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣನಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕಂಸನು ಬಲಯಾದನೋ ಅ ರೀತಿ ಈ ನಾಗನ ಗೌಡರು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸೂತ್ರಗಳು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಸಂದೇಹಾಸ್ಪದವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುವಂತಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನಾಹುತವಾಗುವಂತಿದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೃಷ್ಣನು ಕಂಸಾಸುರನನ್ನು ವಧೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಕೂಡಲೆ ಸ್ವಾಖ್ಯೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಎಂದಾದರೂ ಕೊನೆಗಾಣಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಸಾವಿರಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಮೊಗಲರು, ಪಠಾಣರು, ಇಂಗ್ಲಿಷ್‌ನವರು, ಮರಾಠೆಯವರು, ಇವರುಗಳ ಮೊದಲೊಂದು ಬಂದಿರುವ ಜನ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಅವರುಗಳ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಜನಾಂಗ ಬಹಳ ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ಇದ್ದಂತಹವರ ಗುಂಪೇ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ, ಇದ್ದಂತಹವರನ್ನು ಮೇಲಕ್ಕೆ ಎತ್ತಬೇಕಾದುದು ಈಗಿನ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಆದರೆ ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಒದಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಅವರ ಒಂದು ಅಫಿಡವಿಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪುಟ 3 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. "In Madras also social and economic backwardness of the Communities has been taken into consideration. The Government of Bombay, now Maharashtra have directed that classification on the basis of caste should be abolished from the financial year 1959-60 and replace the classification on the basis of income." ಹೀಗೆ ಇವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಸುಳ್ಳು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ನೋಡಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಸುಪ್ರೀಂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡದೆಯೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅವರ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಹ್ಯಾರಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ವಿಚಿತ್ರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ

ಒಂದು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಗಾರ್ವಮಂಟ್ ಆರ್ಟರ್ ಬೇರೆ ಇದೆ. ಅದೇ ಬೇರೆ-ಇದೇ ಬೇರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಸರ್ವೋಚ್ಚ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆರ್ಟರ್ನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದಾರೆ. I have no information of what criteria has been adopted by the Maharashtra Government for the classification of backward classes. Is it not a fact that the Government Order is different from the report of the Nagan Gowda Committee. So the ruling you gave to-day is perfectly in order. ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆರ್ಟರ್ ಬೇರೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯೇ ಬೇರೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಹೊಡೆದಾಟ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯಿಂದ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿನವೇ ಬೇಡಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬ ಸಂಶಯವುಂಟಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಕೊಡುವುದು, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುವುದು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಜಾತಿ ಭೇದಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದೊಡ್ಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಲಂಗಾಯಿತರದೇ ಆಗಲೇ ಒಕ್ಕಲಿಗರದೇ ಆಗಲೇ ಅಥವಾ ಮೊಡ್ದೆರ್ ಕ್ಯಾಪ್ ಅವರದೇ ಆಗಲೇ ಇಂತಿಂಥಾ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟಿಷ್ಟು ಪರ್ನಂಟೆಜ್ ಎಂದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಶುಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನಾಂಗಗಳ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ವಿದ್ಯಾಪಂತರಾಗಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಾದರೆ ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರೇಕ್ಷಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗ ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನಾಂಗಗಳೂ ಒಂದು ಸಮಾನಾವಕಾಶ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲೂ ನಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲ ಜಾತಿ ಭೇದ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸಗಳು ಕೊನೆಗೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ಪಂಗಡಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಗಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿ ಮೇಲಕ್ಕೆತ್ತ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೊರಟಿರುವ ದಾರಿ ಉದಾತ್ತವಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಧೈರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸಫಲಗೊಳಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರಾಶಾದಾಳುಕರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಇನ್ನು ಆ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜಾತಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಒಬ್ಬ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅವೆಲ್ಲ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಮದುವೆ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರ ಹೇಳುವಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಗನಗೌಡರು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಫೈನಲ್ ವರದಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಇತರ ಅನೇಕ ಜನ-ಹೊರಗಡೆಯವರನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಕೇಳಿ ಎರಾ ಜನಾಂಗಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸಹಿತವಾಗಿ ಏಕೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಈ ನಾಗನಗೌಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಯಾರ್ಯಾರನ್ನು ಬ್ಯಾಕ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಫಾರ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗಂತೂ ಈ ವರದಿಯಿಂದ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಗನಗೌಡರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರ ನಿಕ್ಕಿತು! ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ವರದಿ ಸರ್ವಥಾ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. When he presented this report to the Government, I think he might have lost all wisdom, Sir. With all respect to my friend Dr. Nagan Gowda for his knowledge and ripe experience, he has done great injustice to these minorities. ಕೆಲವು ಜಾತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಫಾರ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಬ್ಯಾಕ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಎಂತಲೂ ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವನ್ನು ಬ್ಯಾಕ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಫಾರ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಪುನಃ ಹೇಳುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ನ್ಯಾಯವೇ? ಎತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನೆರಾ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಾ ಜನಾಂಗದ ಮುಖ್ಯಸ್ಥರಲ್ಲಿ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು? ಹಿಂದುಳಿದವರನ್ನು ಮೇಲಕ್ಕೆ ಎತ್ತಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಠಿಣ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ. ಸೌತ್ ಕೆನರಾ ಭಂಟರು ಫಾರ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಆಗಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಬೇಡ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೇ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಕೆಂದರೆ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ

(ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಒಗ್ಗಟ್ಟು. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಗನಗೂಡ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿದವರಾಗಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ತಾವು ಸಹ ನಮ್ಮ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡು ಬ್ಯಾರ್ ಪರ್ಟ್ ಆದಿರಿ.

ಇದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ, ಇದರ ಫಲವನ್ನು ಅರಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂತಹ ಸರಕಾರ ಸಂಯೋಜಿತರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಈ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚಿನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ):—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ, ಅದು ಉತ್ತಮಗೊಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಎರಳವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟಕರವಾದ ನಮಸ್ಕ. ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಈಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾಡಲು ಹೊರಿದರೆ ಜನ-ತಪ್ಪು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಬಾರಿ ಹಮಸ್ಕ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲ ಸರಕಾರ ಆಡಳಿತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲಿ.

ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ನನಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಠವರಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ವಂದನೆಗಳು.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ (ಹರಿಹರ):—ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ 15 ಮತ್ತು 16ನೇ ವಿಧಾನ ಸ್ವಕಾರಜಾತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸೆಕ್ಸ್ ಈ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಾರತಮ್ಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಈ ವಿಧಿಗಳ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಧೇಯ ಎಂದರೆ 15 ಮತ್ತು 16ನೇ ವಿಧೇಯ ನಾಲ್ಕನೇ ಕಾಲುವಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಗಗಳು ಅರ್ಥಿಕವಾಗಿ ಹಿಂದುಳಿದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವರ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಉತ್ತಮಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದೆ. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ 15 ಮತ್ತು 16ನೇ ವಿಧಿಗಳು ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗದವರುಗಳ ರಕ್ಷಣೆಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ವಿಧಿಗಳು, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂತಃಕಾರ್ಯ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಸಾಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು, ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಹಿಂದುಳಿದಿರುವಂತಹ ಸೆಕ್ಟರ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಟ್ರಿಬ್‌ಗಳು ಎನ್ನುವ ಜಾತಿಗಳ ವರ್ಗದವರಿಗೆ 15-16ನೇ ನಿಯಮಗಳ-ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯ ಕಲಮನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೇ ಎನ್ನುವ ಹಿಂದುಳಿದ ವರ್ಗಗಳವರು ಶೇಕಡಾ 75 ರಷ್ಟು ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಸಾಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಚಿನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತಿತ್ತೆಂದು ನೆನಗನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. 15 ಮತ್ತು 16ನೇ ನಿಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ ಎಂದರೆ Educationally Socially, Backward Community ಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಅರ್ಥಿಕವಾಗಿ ಯಾರು ಹಿಂದುಳಿದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷ ನಾಗನಗೂಡ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು, ಇದನ್ನು ತಳಹದಿಯಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಏನಾದರೂ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಆಕ್ಷನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನು ತಂದಾಗ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಲ್ಲುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಧೃಢವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬರೆ. ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಶಬ್ದಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂದರೆ. "Socially Economically Backward Community" ಎಂದು. ಅರ್ಥಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು 15-16ನೇ ವಿಧಿಯುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರ ನಿರ್ಧಾರವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೇರೆ Criteria ಮಾಡಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು Alternative

ಅಗಲಾಡ ಬೇರೇನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. S.S.L.C. ವಾಸಾಧವರು ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ Materials ನ್ನು ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಇಟ್ಟು. ಸರಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಜಾತಿಯೇ ಇರಕೂಡದು ಎಂದಿರುವಾಗ ಇದು ಬಹು ಕಷ್ಟವಾದ ವಿಷಯ 15-16 ನೇ ನಿಯಮದಂತೆ ಜಾತ್ಯಾತೀತವಾದ ರಾಜ್ಯವಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಧಾರವಿರುವಾಗ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಮಿತಿ ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಈಗ ಜೈದ್ಪುರ್ ಕ್ಯಾನ್ಸ್ ಇದೆ. ಇವರು ಗೃಹ ಕೆಲವು ಮೀಸಲು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಜಾತಿಗಳವರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಕೋದರೆ ಈ 15 ಮತ್ತು 16 ನೇ ಕಲಮನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯ? ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ "More Backward Communities" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತ ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಶೇಕಡಾ 80 ರಷ್ಟು ಜನರೂ ಬ್ಯಾಕ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತ ಹೀಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ? ಪ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನರಸಿಂಹನ್‌ರವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರಿ ಇರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will now call upon the Hon'ble Minister for Social Welfare to speak.

Sri F. X. DENIS PINTO.—I have a few remarks to make on behalf of a minor community.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may speak very briefly.

† Sri F. X. DENIS PINTO.—I rise before this House to voice the feelings of the Christians that they have been very badly let down by the Nagan Gowda Committee. The Christians have been a Backward Community since 1921 and now all of a sudden to be classed as forward is tragedy to which we cannot reconcile. As suggested by my friend Mr. Mallaradhya, the criteria adopted by the Nagan Gowda Committee in regard to social and educational backwardness is defective and they should have taken the economic backwardness because once a person is economically backward, he would be socially and educationally also backward. To determine the economic backwardness of a Community we have ample data. If the Committee had only cared to find out the number of land owners, the number of the persons who paid sales tax or income tax assessments in a community, the Committee could find out which community is economically sound and could be classified as forward. Instead of doing any such thing, the Committee went on finding out how many students were in high school classes. Even there they did not have sufficient statistics or responsible data. As Mr. Mallaradhya pointed out they simply asked the Census Officer to give details in respect of the Education Department. Likewise they relied on some date, right or wrong, to decide representation in Government service. Merely because large number of a community are employed as peons, it does not mean that community is forward in every respect.

The Ministers of the Government who have toured the districts know how poor the Christians are. They are leading a hand-to-mouth existence. By being classified as forward, the member of this Community cannot get entry into Government services or admission to technical colleges. I would appeal to the Government to do justice to this community.



Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Is the Hon'ble Member aware that Mr. Corbett has taken the stand that the stand of Government in classifying his community as 'forward' is correct and just? Why then does he want his community to be called 'backward'.

Sri F. X. DENIS PINTO.—Mr. Corbett was speaking of the Anglo-Indian community. They have always been forward.

Sir N. RACHAIAH.—Sir, I am grateful.....

Sri B. SHAMSUNDAR.—Before the Hon'ble Minister speaks, I wish to refer the attention of the House to a reply given by the Chief Minister that the Government would not take into consideration caste or community in issuing Government Orders for allotment of seats in colleges. Taking this report now, would it not amount to going contrary to the decision of Government?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no point of order involved. It is a question of clarification.

†Sri N. RACHAIAH (Minister for Agriculture and Social Welfare).—In accordance with the ruling given by you, Sir, I have to confine myself only to the report of the Nagan Gowda Committee because the Government order itself is *sub judice*.

Sir, this is a very important subject. It is good of you, Mr. Speaker, to have allowed this subject to be discussed on the last atleast for 2½ hours. I have heard the Members with keen interest and I have closely followed their arguments. The term 'backwardness' is used in the Constitution itself. The problems of the backward classes are the problems of the nation and would have to be tackled as such. It is the duty of the nation to reassure the backward classes and to allay the fears and apprehensions entertained by them. I heard Mr. Mallaradhy and several members saying that because of the special concessions granted to members of the backward classes, the advanced classes would suffer. At the same time, certain people feel that unless they are recognised by the State as backward, they would get no advantage. But such a notion held by the forward communities is baseless. The framers of the Constitution, under the inspiration given by the Mahatma Gandhi and our Prime Minister have enunciated in the Constitution certain safeguards for the backward sections of the population. The Scheduled Castes have certain safeguards in respect of entry into Government service, admission to colleges and also political safeguards.

4-30 P.M.

And that has been extended by another ten year period. Political reservations according to that Constitutional provision are confined only to next ten years. But with regard to other safeguards, they continue and there won't be any time restriction made in the Constitution itself. So there won't be any apprehension with regard to these provisions. With regard to the backward sections of the people in the country,

Article 15 (4) is applicable. This is a fundamental right of every citizen in the country; an amendment was actually moved to the Constitution in 1951 by adding sub-clause (4) of Article 15. According to sub-clause (4), special provision for backward classes has been provided. The object is to bring Article 15 and also Article 29 in line with Articles 16 (4), 46 and 320 to make it constitutional for the State to reserve seats for educational backward classes of citizens, scheduled castes and the public tribes in institutions as well as to make such other special provision as may be necessary for their advancement. So this is a fundamental right and it shall be the primary duty of the Government to see that all backward sections of the State under this provision are given protection and we have to give all necessary safeguards for their social and educational advancement. In the same way Article 16 comes under fundamental right and Article 16 (4) is again added in the year 1951 and that also comes under fundamental right. Article 16 (1) states like this:

“There shall be equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State.”

Under Article 16 (4), the State Government can make any provision to reserve appointments or posts in favour of any backward class of citizens so long as they are not adequately represented in the services under the State. This clause is in the nature of exception to clause (1) of Article 16. Even among the members of the advanced section, if they want any aid to be given to them educational or economic, it is open to the State Government to make any provision for their advancement. There need not be any apprehension in the minds of the advanced sections that they are not going to get anything. It is baseless. But at the same time in a parliamentary democracy like ours, every citizen is guaranteed equal opportunity, equal right and equal liberty and when every citizen is guaranteed such equal opportunity, it is quite natural that such sections of people who are socially and educationally backward and those who are economically and politically backward also demand such concessions to enable them to come up socially and educationally and through the social and educational forwardness or advancement, they want to improve their economic status and also political advancement. After all this is a very simple argument which one can understand. But there is an argument now suggested to the Government that we should not take social backwardness or educational backwardness into consideration. If the Government, whether it be the State Government or the Central Government, were to accept this suggestion of economic basis as the criterion, it is as good as not providing Article 15 (4) and Article 16 (4). The framers of the Constitution had in their mind the fact that there was a defective social order in our society. It is not the Government that is responsible for the backwardness of the backward people; it is the social structure that has been there for ages and that has been responsible for the backwardness of the people belonging to the backward classes. So we need not blame anybody

(Sri N. RACHAIAH)

Until and unless we create healthy social conditions where every citizen feels that he is equal socially, we cannot accept the economic basis as the criterion for determining the backward classes. The great Basavanna about 800 years back said "I can tolerate any inequality but not social inequality." If the Harijans are backward, it is because of social subjugation. They are the most hard working classes; still they are backward socially. To-day in spite of the tall talks and suggestions and all that in the country, I know that a Harijan cannot become a pujari in the temple.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIAH.—Our Chief Minister took 'thirtham' from a Harijan pujari in Channapatna taluk.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—We cannot do it because we have to respect the feelings of the people. We have to gradually remove them. Even advanced sections are not opposed to it, but there must be a gradual change, continuous change and Government are trying their best to see that in a parliamentary democracy such feelings which are an impediment to the progress of the nation or the society are removed and Government are bound to achieve their objective, namely, casteless and classless society and till then all sections of people will have to bear with the Government to see that such an atmosphere is created. Anyway, Sir, it is the duty of the Government to see that social justice is done to all the sections including backward classes. But the fundamental thing that we must do is to destroy the caste system root and branch. That is the main recommendation made by Jayaprakash Narayan Committee. Sir, it is not so easy to change the outlook of the people in society where the percentage of literacy in the rural area is hardly 2. Sir, I must pay tribute to Dr. Nagan Gowda and the Members of the Committee for within the time available and with the material made available by Government and other departments, they have been able to submit a very good report. It may not be a perfect report because in a progressing country, no law can be a perfect one. Even our Constitution has undergone amendments.

Sir, in the Constitution, it is said that those who are socially and educationally backward should be classified as backward classes. Because there is caste system and that caste system has given different status to different people, they are to be given this consideration. This is the only criteria. Whatever is done on the basis of caste is not unconstitutional. If the element of caste is not taken as the basis, how to find out the section which is socially and educationally backward? The moment we introduce economic backwardness, those who are socially and educationally forward also come under this and those who are backward really in all these respects will not be in a position to get the benefit.

Sir, there is another misconception that among the backward classes, even the rich will get the benefits. It is not so. For giving Government

of India scholarships, they have fixed a limit of Rs. 500 income. For the sons of those parents who are classified as backward but whose income is above Rs. 500 will not be given scholarships. So, it is not as if all the backward class people however rich, are getting the benefit. So, Sir, unless the case is not removed through an amendment to the Constitution, we will have to take caste into consideration. They have said:

“The term ‘Social backwardness’ is not defined in the Constitution. The report of the Backward Classes Commission also does not give a correct definition of this term. Higher social status has generally been accorded on the basis of caste for centuries.

Social backwardness of a community should be judged mainly by the status accorded to that community in society in general (apart from individuals). A contributory factor is the general economic condition of that community. Based on the above criterion the communities mentioned in statement-2 have been classified as socially backward.”

Sir, they have been very clear in their recommendations.

Even with regard to educational backwardness under the constitution, it says, that such of the Members of the country or society or citizens who are socially and educationally backward. So, not letterally backward whether literacy or education is the criterion. But that have taken not the literacy, but they have taken only the education of the students belonging to a particular community found in the classified list of the backward classes. The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition referred to one aspect which is an answer to his own doubt. The Committee should have taken the number of persons who have passed the SSLC. He has suggested a better criteria under the educational standard. So, There will not be any recommendation on the educational backwardness. They have tried to give best recommendation even with regard to this aspect.

In a society like ours, the society being what it is, under the circumstances in the present set up, we have to take caste into consideration. That caste criteria has been recommended by the Committee. It is open to the future Government after General Elections and future legislators, to re-think and review the matter. It is a subject which is going to be a continuing process, even for future generation till we eradicate the caste system, till we have a society which is casteless and classless. Till then, this talk would be there and there will be a tendency either on the part of Government to see that doubts and arguments are removed in the minds of Hon'ble Members and also in the mind of the people in the State.

Lastly, I have been very thankful to all the Members and the Leader of the Opposition for giving their suggestion. We bear all these suggestions in mind while taking any future decision.

(Sri N. RACHAIAH)

I would have liked to mention some important points of the Government Order. This is *sub judice* and therefore I do not wish to refer to it. I have confined only to the recommendations of the Report.

Lastly, I am very thankful to you Sir, the Hon'ble Chief Minister and the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition and Members of the opposition for giving a patient hearing. We are parting Sir, and I wish every Hon'ble Member and you every luck. You Sir, have been kind enough in your conduct of deliberations of this august House in the best interests of the State and the interest of all Members. I wish every success to the Chief Minister and all the Hon'ble Members both on this side and on the Opposition.

I had the privilege of speaking even at the last minute of the Session by way of reply to this debate. I am really very much honoured. I thank you very much. I once again wish all success to every Hon'ble Member of this House in the general elections.

### VALIDICTORY SPEECHES

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we rise, I have to make a few observations on the work that has been so far done during the last five years. We are parting. Let us hope that we will meet again.

To day, I am reminded of what is considered to be a sunny day' in West Germany. A sunny day is a day on which the sun shines. It falls in the Spring in West Germany and on other parts of the Continent and on that day the Sun shines. Taking advantage of of the sun shine, they drink, dance, howl and roar ; I and my friends were going from Hamburg to a small place and we were told that it was a sunny day. We are all aware that on the continent there is generally chilly weather and an Indian feels it is not so good a weather. Fathers were wearing all sorts of dresses. They were roaring about, howling out and dancing. Some were doing all sorts of acrobatics. I think it is rather a Sunny day in our Assembly to-day. I do not think we have observed the Rules of procedure so much. I have agreed to my ruling being challenged and indirectly challenged. Some friends were so very vociferous. In fact I enjoyed the whole thing. At another time, I would have felt a little bit pained in my heart. To-day, I did not feel it. This being the last occasion, I think Members had an opportunity to do what they liked provided they did not raise a pendamonium.

In the morning I have given statistics of what happened during the last five years. I have considered what has taken place during the last five years and I hold that the record of work is not insignificant. I should say that it compares quite well with the work of other Assemblies. Of course, we would have done much better. But there were difficulties in our way. Else we could do much better. We go